

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 22, 24, 28, and 30 are independent and hereby amended. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12-21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31 and 33-42 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification and Drawings, specifically pages, 27-31, 34-36, 39-42 and Figures 5-7, 12-13, 18-19. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747 to Bedard (hereinafter, merely “Bedard”), in view of European Patent Application No. 0717346 to Takiguchi et al. (hereinafter, merely “Takiguchi”), in view of U.S. Patent 6,002,401 to Baker (hereinafter, merely “Baker”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,392,670 to Takeuchi et al. (hereinafter, merely “Takeuchi”).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information providing apparatus for providing a desired information screen by making selection from icons respectively assigned to information screens, comprising:

means for displaying a menu of recommended channels, said recommended channels selected based on high past frequencies of selection;

means for displaying a menu of categories, said categories containing programs classified into said categories based on program information;

means for displaying a menu of media, said menu of media representing contents of a plurality of recording/reproducing media;

operation information input means inputted with operation information based on selection operation,

wherein the operation information entails operation keys, which are input sequentially, and are simultaneously operated...”
(emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Bedard relates to the presentation of television programs and television program guide information to a television viewer, where on-screen program listings and program selections are tailored based upon a viewer's past viewing behavior.

As understood by Applicants, Takiguchi relates to relates to a hierarchical data display method for retrieving and displaying data from a data base, file system, in which a plurality of data items are managed hierarchically, and to a browser system. More particularly, Takiguchi relates to a time-series data display method for displaying a plurality of data items that are managed using associated dates, and to an information processing system for realizing the method. Takiguchi also relates to an image editing method and system to be implemented in drawing software for handing images or a data base system.

As understood by Applicants, Baker relates to a pictorial user interface for accessing information in an electronic file system which provides a pictorial image which is linked to a file directory and which identifies the file directory.

As understood by Applicants, Takeuchi relates to a device setup support system, for supporting user operation under guidance on an output unit when the user sets up a device in a predetermined state.

It is respectfully submitted that the applied combination of Bedard, Takiguchi, Baker and Takeuchi does not teach the above-recited features of independent claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action cites Column 4, lines 49-65 and Column 7, lines 19-27 of Bedard (see Office Action page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion that Bedard provides the disclosure missing from Takiguchi, Baker and Takeuchi.

The Office Action cites column 4, lines 49-65 of Bedard, which recites "...an associated total viewing unit counter 204 and one or more individual category or subcategory viewing unity counters 206. For a viewer's viewer profile collection period, total viewing counter 204 of entry 202 represents the total number of viewing units the viewer viewed the corresponding channel..."

The Office Action cites column 7, lines 19-27 of Bedard, which recites "...the information captured by the viewer profile can be used by and EPG to tailor display 400 so as to provide faster access to information concerning the viewers preferred channels and/or programming categories..."

Applicants respectfully submit that Bedard, Takiguchi, Baker, or Takeuchi, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of an information providing apparatus for

providing a desired information screen by making selection from icons respectively assigned to information screens, comprising: means for displaying a menu of recommended channels, said recommended channels selected based on high past frequencies of selection; and means for displaying a menu of media, said menu of media representing contents of a plurality of recording/reproducing media, recited in claim 1.

Indeed, Applicants submit that an associated total viewing unit counter and one or more individual category or subcategory viewing unity counters utilized during a collection period, which represents the total number of viewing units the viewer viewed on a corresponding channel, where a viewer profile is tailored to grant faster access to preferred channels and categories as in Bedard, discloses no suggestion of displaying a menu of recommended channels which are selected based on high past frequencies of selection and displaying a menu of media which represents contents of a plurality of recording/reproducing media.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Bedard, Takiguchi, Baker, or Takeuchi, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of an information providing apparatus for providing a desired information screen by making selection from icons respectively assigned to information screens wherein the operation information entails operation keys, which are input sequentially, and are simultaneously operated, recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that not only does Bedard, Takiguchi, Baker, or Takeuchi, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed features, but the combination of Bedard, Takiguchi, Baker, or Takeuchi is improper because it lacks motivation. Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine a television viewer profile, as disclosed in Bedard, with a time-series data display method for displaying

time-series data items, as disclosed in Takiguchi, with a pictorial user interface for accessing information in an electronic file system, as disclosed in Baker, with an HTML file corresponding to a browser as a display screen, as disclosed in Takeuchi. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Bedard, Takiguchi, Baker, or Takeuchi is the result of improper hindsight using Applicant's claimed invention as a blueprint. Applicants also respectfully submit that picking and choosing particular features from divergent patents is improper and such a combination may not be used as a basis of rejection.

Therefore, for the above-stated reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Bedard, Takiguchi, Baker, or Takeuchi is improper and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 3, 7, 9, 22, 24, 28, and 30 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to claim 1, and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 22, 24, 28, and 30 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800